

MINUTES

November 20-21, 1975

The Library of Congress
Wilson Room
Washington, D.C.

Commission Members Present: Aines (Friday only); Becker, Burkhardt, Casey, Cuadra, Dunlap, Lerner, Lorenz, Scott, Velde, Wu, and Moore (Presiding)

Staff Members Present : Trezza, Price, Reszetar, Thompson and Cranwell

Guest Present : Mr. James Skipper, President
Research Libraries Group
(transcript attached)

Mrs. Moore presided. The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as submitted.

Commission Appointments

The status of the appointments/reappointments of Commissioners was reviewed. The Presidential Personnel Office is still in the process of screening names. They have indicated that Dr. Burkhardt will be recommended for reappointment as Chairman. It is expected that the list of nominees will be sent to the U.S. Senate for confirmation in late January.

Dr. Burkhardt expressed his appreciation to all of the members of the Commission for their support. He also suggested that a change in the Commission's organic Act would be necessary in order to avoid the long break between the expiration of a Commissioner's term and the appointment/reappointment process. The revision perhaps could be worded so that a Commissioner would remain on the Commission until either a reappointment or a successor had been appointed.

James Madison Memorial Library Building

Dr. Boorstin, prior to the opening of the Commission meeting, and John Lorenz, during the Commission meeting, reviewed with the Commission the attempt by the House of Representatives to divert the use of the new Madison Memorial Library Building from library usage to Congressional usage. It was agreed that the Commission would issue a resolution strongly urging the appropriate House Committee and the leadership of the House to appropriate the funds necessary to complete the Building for the Library of Congress. It was suggested, in addition to the resolution, that all Commissioners personally contact their Representatives. The resolution was approved by the Commission.

A Joint Resolution on the National Program Document

A draft Joint Congressional Resolution--to establish a policy for developing a National Program for Library and Information Services, to create a means to implement that policy, and for other purposes--was discussed. Suggestions were made that the Joint Resolution not include a section on the White House Conference as this was a separate issue and should be so handled. There was considerable discussion about the wording of the role of the Library of Congress and there was a general feeling that the legal designation of the Library of Congress as "The National Library" should not be included in the Joint Resolution but should be handled in special legislation by the Library of Congress. The role of the Library of Congress in the National Program Document, however, was legitimate and, therefore, should be included in the resolution.

There was discussion of the advisability and/or practicability of using a Joint Resolution rather than the Bill format. It was agreed that Mr. Trezza would work with John Lorenz to try to verify the procedure for handling a Joint Resolution and to determine what limitations, if any, would be involved.

A revision will be developed by the staff and reviewed by the special Legislative Committee before the next Commission meeting. Dr. Burkhardt appointed a Committee consisting of John Lorenz as Chairman and Louis Lerner and Catherine Scott as members.

Status of Projects

National Periodicals System

Mr. Trezza reported that the task force on this project would start its work in January. Mr. Eugene Palmour has agreed to work on a part-time basis (40% of his time for the period of January through December 1976) with the task force.

National Inventory of Library Needs

This study calls for the examination of existing standards and development of an inventory statistical measure for public, academic, and school libraries. The Advisory Committee, which was established will adopt a set of "needs criteria" for the limited purposes of this Inventory, held its first meeting on November 10, 1975. It was suggested by Miss Scott that one or two Commissioners participate in future Advisory Committee meetings. Commissioners especially interested in the project were to notify Mr. Trezza.

Library Photocopying Study

The Request for Proposal (RFP) is still in the drafting process. The specific objective of this study will be to: (1) study the incidence of photocopying of all library materials on library staff controlled equipment; (2) determine what patterns of traffic, if any, exist for photocopies of serials in lieu of Interlibrary Loans; (3) determine the characteristics of such photocopies of serials; and (4) determine what costs may be associated with a mechanism for administering a transaction-based royalty payment mechanism. It is expected that the RFP will be ready for release on December 1, 1975. The study will require two man-years and three-fourths of the costs will be financed by the National Science Foundation and one-fourth by NCLIS. Mr. Trezza invited a member of CONTU to serve on the Advisory Committee to the study. Members of the NCLIS Copyright Committee will also serve.

CONTU

Mr. Trezza attended the first meeting of CONTU held at the Library of Congress on November 19, 1975. He gave them each a copy of the National Program Document. Ms. Barbara Ringer, Register of Copyright, stated that this would be essential reading for them because the library photocopying is tied-in many ways with the national plan.

Mr. Trezza summarized the meeting of the Upstairs/Downstairs group for the CONTU members. He also discussed the Photocopy Study which led to a lengthy discussion. Mr. Dan Lacy wanted to know why the collection of detailed data was necessary--"all that is needed is a mechanism for payment."

CONTU considered the NCLIS resolution and tabled it without prejudice, indicating that they were not prepared--at least at this time--to raise any issues with Congress regarding the current copyright legislation. They further indicated that NCLIS should not hesitate to express its views on copyright directly to Congress.

Mr. Becker stated that an Amendment offered by Senator Mathias to the Copyright Bill on the subject of public broadcasting could have a serious effect on public libraries. The implication of the Amendment is that the author does not have control over the use of his own materials over public broadcasting stations. This includes literary works and could, therefore, have an effect on libraries. Mr. Becker suggested that the Copyright Committee should study the Mathias Amendment in order to determine whether the Commission should recommend that literary works be excluded.

Mr. Lorenz briefly outlined Ms. Ringer's testimony regarding Sec. 107 and 108. He indicated that she agrees that the present wording of Sec. 108(g) is not fair for normal interlibrary loan situations. Perhaps what the Congress really needs is to identify those libraries where the purpose of systematic photocopying is to reduce periodical subscriptions and that should be the real focus of the limitations to photocopying. Librarians represented through ALA, MLA, and SLA do not agree that libraries participate in systematic copying just to reduce subscriptions. Reduction in book budgets, they say, is the issue.

Mr. Lerner suggested that all of the Commission's resolutions on the subject of copyright be sent to Congressman Kastenmeier and the members of his Committee. He stated that the staff should develop relations with the staff of the Kastenmeier Committee and that the Commission should seek the opportunity to testify the next time hearings are called.

It was agreed that a new resolution on the copyright legislation, based on the original resolution passed by the Commission at its September meeting, be drafted. The Copyright Committee would be asked to review and react to the draft. Mr. Trezza indicated that he would send it to the other Commissioners for their information, as well as for any comments they desired to submit.

The Copyright Committee consists of Martin Goland, Chairman, Catherine Scott, John Lorenz, and Frederick Burkhardt. Joseph Becker was added to the Committee.

Federal Funding for Public Libraries

The RFP was listed in the Commerce Business Daily and a number of proposals were submitted. These proposals were reviewed by Messrs. Trezza, Price and Kirschenbaum (USOE, Office of Planning). The evaluation has been completed and the Office of Education is corresponding with those firms whose proposals are acceptable but which need additional clarification. A final decision on award of the contract should be completed in January 1.

There was considerable discussion about Commission participation in the reading and evaluation of proposals. In the future, as a matter of policy, one or more Commissioners will participate with staff in the evaluation process.

National Program Document

Synopsis

Dr. Raymond Swank completed the synopsis of the National Program Document. It was reviewed by Dr. Burkhardt, Mr. Becker and staff, and with some minor revisions accepted. It will be included in the Annual Report and will also be available in the future as a separate document.

Matrix

Mr. Becker prepared individual sheets on seven of the eight objectives which suggest research, study, and task force activity for implementation of each objective. Commissioners were invited to submit ideas to the staff for the expansion of the matrix. Mr. Becker stated that a definite schedule should be set for the Chairman and the Executive Director, along with other Commissioners, to call on various governmental organizations such as GSA, Interior, Labor, Bureau of Standards, Library of Medicine, etc., in an attempt to get their cooperation, help and possible funding in work toward implementation of the various objectives contained in the National Program Document. Mr. Lorenz stated that we should strive for a coordinated approach for funding research and development programs in the area of library and information services so we can move forward effectively and rapidly in meeting the objectives of the national program. He further stated that we should be in a position to say to Congress that NCLIS has begun to harness the resources of other agencies to help further our goals. The only course of action we can take at this time to move our program along, said Mr. Becker, is to increase our funding capability by seeking funds from other agencies.

It was generally agreed that we now needed to develop a new time-line.

Endorsements

Mr. Trezza reported that endorsements of the National Program Document in principle and concept had been received from the following organizations: ALA, ARL, SLA, ASIS, and AALL. Action by the Medical Library Association is expected shortly. Additional endorsements will be forthcoming from groups such as IIA, COSLA, etc.

White House Conference

Mr. Casey reported that the Governor of New York has issued the "call" for the state conference in support of the White House Conference on Library and Information Services. Governor Carey has indicated that the state cannot provide funds but they can, hopefully, be obtained from other sources. Mr. Trezza indicated that a number of states have already committed themselves to state conferences. Those who have come to our attention are Washington, Utah, Ohio, Nevada and Illinois.

Col. Aines is developing a statement on the White House Conference based on the ideas presented at the last meeting by each of the Commissioners. He hopes to have a document ready for consideration and approval at the February meeting.

Resolution on School Libraries and Learning Resources

A draft resolution was discussed and the decision was to request the staff to look into the matter again. Mr. Trezza agreed to talk with Mr. Dick Hays, Acting Director of the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources, USOE, to try to see whether the problem could be resolved in regulations rather than by amendments to the law. He stated that he would also discuss the matter with Ms. Eileen Cooke of the ALA Washington Office. Mrs. Wu expressed her strong support for the thrust of the resolution and asked that the matter be on the agenda for further discussion and possible action at the February meeting.

Annual Report

The Commission expressed pleasure with the draft they had received. The two portions that had been missing (regional hearings by Mrs. Dorothy Schwenz and the synopsis of the National Program Document by Raymond Swank) have been received, edited, and will be incorporated into the final report. Mr. Trezza indicated that our deadline would be met.

Budget

We are still operating on a continuing resolution. The Conference Committee will be meeting to discuss the differences in the House and Senate versions of the Labor/HEW Bill. The Senate has agreed to give the NCLIS \$468,000 and two professional positions, whereas the House version is at the same level as last year (\$409,000 and no additional positions). Mr. Trezza indicated that he was hopeful that the Conference Committee would agree on the higher budget. Major credit for any success we may have in getting the \$468,000 is due to the dedicated work of Mrs. Moore. She has worked closely with Senator McClellan, who has promised his support.

Invitation to Visit Taiwan

Mrs. Wu extended an invitation to each Commissioner and members of the Executive Staff to visit Taiwan and to be the guest of the Ministry of Education for one week. Transportation from the United States to Taiwan and return would, of course, be the responsibility of each individual. It was agreed that interested Commissioners would inform Mrs. Wu between now and the next meeting of the Commission.

International Relations

Col. Aines reported that he attended the OECD meeting in Paris, France. He presented a brief report at the Conference on the National Program Document. The participants' major interest was in the technological aspects of our program. We are regarded as a testing ground that will, in effect, point the direction that they will either follow or avoid. Col. Aines suggested closer relationship in the future between the Commission and the OECD. Mr. Trezza discussed the proposal on the study of international relations and its role that had been discussed at the previous meeting. It was agreed that Mr. Foster Mohrhardt had a good reputation in the international field and was a logical choice for working with the Commission in this area. Dr. Burkhardt agreed that we should move ahead and suggested that early in the planning a meeting should be held with Mr. John Richardson in the State Department so that we might coordinate our activities.

Private Sector

Dr. Cuadra reminded the Commission that the role of the private sector in library and information services is of major importance and needs to be developed beyond the initial statements in the National Program Document. We need to help develop ground-rules and principles, try to answer the questions of who does the Government help, and under what circumstances? Would an act such as designating OCLC, or some other public organization, as a National Bibliographic Center injure the private sector to the point of eliminating them as a competitive force? Dr. Cuadra urged that we move ahead with the background paper and meeting that Col. Aines briefly discussed at the last meeting. Further work is being undertaken by Col. Aines, and it is hoped that some progress can be reported at the next meeting.

Speakers' Bureau

Mr. Casey recommended that the Commission set up a formal Speakers' Bureau. After some discussion, it was decided that this would not be undertaken. Organizations should feel free to request speakers without any urging from the Commission.

Next Commission Meeting

The dates for the next meeting are February 12 and 13, 1976. Since the Wilson Room is taken on that date, Mr. Trezza indicated that he would try to schedule the meeting at a hotel for the convenience of the Commissioners. There would be an advantage to having the meetings in the same location that the Commissioners are housed.

In closing, each Commissioner was urged to visit his Congressman and Senator, and to try to get to know them and familiarize them with the work of the Commission on a continuing basis.

PRESENTATION BY

James Skipper
President
Research Libraries Group

Before the
National Commission on Libraries and Information Science
November 21, 1975

As you may know, the Research Libraries Group is comprised of the Libraries of Columbia, Harvard, and Yale Universities and the research libraries of the New York Public Library. We are now operating under a memorandum of understanding signed by all of these institutions and are in the process of formally incorporating in Connecticut as a not-for-profit organization. In discussing RLG, it is logical, and perhaps productive, to begin by asking why. Why was it started? It started, I think, for a variety of reasons--one of which was action on the intellectual conviction that no longer can any one library assume that it can be self-sufficient in providing the resources and services required by its constituency. It is interesting that this, and many of the other observations made, is reflected in the publications of this Commission. In keeping with the last observation I made some years ago, Paul Buck, then Librarian of Harvard University, stated that, at that time, the Harvard Libraries were less able to meet the demands from the teaching and research programs than was possible fifteen years ago when the collection was half that size. This is simply one way of illustrating the kinds of pressures that have been developing, and the kinds of demands for services which have been developing and impinging on the research libraries of this country--a story which I am sure you have heard many times in the past years. Secondly, there were economic pressures, and I needn't burden you with detailed exposition here. We are all familiar with the problems of inflation in book prices.

Dollar devaluation abroad was particularly serious for research libraries who purchase 40-50% of their materials in foreign parts. For instance, when I was in Lichtenstein, I went in at a time when you could buy 4.80 francs with one U.S. dollar, and when I left you could buy 2.6 francs with one U.S. dollar, so this is just one illustration of the problem. Another element is that all four members of RLG are private institutions--that is--they are supported by private funds. The decline in the stockmarket and the investment market has had some serious implications and then, of course, there has been the reduction in the level of Federal funding in the past six or seven years. Coupled with this, as part of the economic picture, is the fact that research libraries, like any large complex organization, reach a point at which they have to make very substantial new investments to produce very modest increments in

services. You can apply this to cataloging; you can apply it to resource development; you can apply it to almost any area. We found ourselves in this situation, and the question was what to do about it. It is perfectly obvious that research libraries could not expect to double their budgets and triple their staffs every ten years in perpetuity in response to increased demands, inflation, and other factors of this type. The third service problem concerns the obvious overlap and duplication in collections and services within these institutions, especially in parochial areas.

So, my conclusion is that RLG was begun as the viable alternative to former attempts at local self-sufficiency. This is the sum and substance of why we are in business today. Our objective is to improve library services to our constituents; to participate in, and contribute to, national programs for resource development and bibliographic control; and, lastly, to reduce the rate in increase in operating budgets.

How are these questions and objectives to be accomplished? We formally started with a report written by Joseph Rosenthal from the University of California at Berkeley. Mr. Rosenthal's report provided us with a road map which described how we could go from Station A to Station B; what detours might be available; what sights to see along the way; and what had to be done by way of accomplishing objectives. Enroute to begin the implementation of some of the selected recommendations from Rosenthal's report, a series of committees was appointed. Now, as you probably have experienced, committees are wonderful instruments for achieving a consensus and for providing for participation from a diverse audience, but they are murderously slow and inefficient in many respects, and we have experienced this. We anticipated it, and I think that it was obviously a wise thing to do because we were dealing with four old, large complex organizations--three of whom had to be responsive to faculty concerns and considerations of various types. This was our way of achieving a consensus and providing for staff participation. We have focused our attention on three major areas, and we have been very careful not to be trapped by dissipating our energies and our resources too thinly. The first of these is a program of improving access to the resources of these four institutions, who now hold somewhere between 26-1/2 and 30 million volumes, plus many millions of additional items, manuscripts, newspapers, documents, pamphlets, microforms, and the usual types of materials found in research libraries.

We attempted to improve access on two levels--both perfectly conventional. One is the interlibrary loan business and the other is by on-site visits by faculty and students by qualified users--from each of the four institutions. We have been successful in producing a

policy statement which, in effect, provides for access on a reciprocal basis among these four institutions. In other words, a faculty person or a student from Harvard visiting Columbia will, insofar as possible, have the same type of access to Columbia collections as the Columbia student and faculty. This was a difficult policy statement to achieve, not because of the reluctance, but because of a great number of practical difficulties. Some of these libraries, take Avery at Columbia, for instance, have written into their charter that the materials shall not be circulated--people can come use them--but that gift was received on the condition that the books will not circulate. As many of you know, the books (some 4 million volumes) in the research libraries in New York Public Library, Fifth Avenue and 42nd Street, have never circulated, with the minor exception being the United Nations when it started. Last October, in response to opportunities offered by RLG, the trustees at the New York Public Library voted that materials from the research collections could circulate to the other three members thereby providing a tremendous advantage for the constituents of the academic institutions. We are providing full service for undergraduates who are normally excluded from interlibrary transactions, and for good reasons.

By way of mechanics, we contracted with the United Parcel Service for delivery--we found it much better for U.S. mail. We installed TELEX for communication of requests and responses to these requests. We have established a bibliographic center and space was provided at no cost by Yale University whose function it is to monitor the requests and make sure the response is back on time and that nothing falls between schools. This facility will also be responsible for gathering the management data that we need to make the program function efficiently, to identify the kind of user requesting this material, to identify the kinds of material supplied, to identify the turn-around time, and, perhaps of greater importance, to identify the materials which can not be found within the collections of the Research Libraries Group, which gives us an opportunity to do something about that.

Experience to date, and the evidence is very tentative because we have been in operation for only a limited time, suggests that we have had a very high percentage of materials requested within the RLG school. We have reduced, by approximately one-half, the turn-around time between response and request. We have considerably improved the reliability of delivery, and we have found that in very few instances is the requested item in active use in the institution which can supply it, which relieves one of our greatest anxieties--that a very active interlibrary access program would cause disruption on the local level and get the local faculty on our backs. This has not happened.

Related to the shared access or shared resources program is the concern for book preservation. This is not a very popular or sexy topic--it seems to be restricted to large libraries that have been collecting the materials from all over the world for a long period of time and have over-heated their stack for the last fifty to seventy-five years. But we do know that in our libraries an appreciable number of our books and our journals are deteriorating because of the reaction of additives in book paper to the atmospheric conditions. I am sure you have been through this one before. To assure shared access to future generations, we consider it our responsibility to do something now about preserving existing collections at the present time.

The second major program is an attempt to reduce unnecessary duplication in developing our collection. Before RLG, these four institutions, at least, had no alternatives. There was the Center for Research Libraries, and there was the conventional interlibrary loan traffic, neither of which really met the needs that would permit reduction of unnecessary duplication in collection materials in these libraries. We are concentrating at the present time on reducing serials subscriptions. We are doing this for two reasons: (1) they have become tremendously expensive. The inflation rate in serials subscriptions has been even greater than in books; and (2) they are beginning to overwhelm the book budget. When I left Berkeley, our periodicals budget there was perhaps 45%. I am told that it is now pushing 65%, and this is producing serious imbalances in collection development because you cannot get a reasonable sample of monographic and other materials to balance the serials collections. Another reason is that these expenditures constitute a first mortgage on book funds. We have to set that money aside and related to that first mortgage are costs, indirect costs, associated with checking in, binding, and storing that file indefinitely. So this indicates that periodicals are a logical place to start examining for purposes of reducing duplication. Now, let me say, parenthically, that it is perfectly obvious that these four institutions, all of whom support an extensive array of teaching and research programs of very high quality, are not going to seriously cut into basic collections, i.e., dramatic literature, French literature, American history, English history, and so forth. This is simply not in the cards. We will make an attempt, however, to reduce local duplication of titles in these areas. This duplication occurred mainly in the go-go years of the 1960's when the Ford Foundation was supporting area studies and the Federal Government was supporting sciences. Little institutes popped up and all of them started subscribing to duplicate copies of journals. Now the day of reckoning has come.

What we expect to happen is that we will be able to reduce serials subscriptions in peripheral areas and in peripheral subjects and use those funds to acquire unique materials, which we cannot now afford. This is not an effort to throw up our hands, abandon the ship, and cut back to running a first-rate library. It is simply an effort to use our funds to the maximum in providing services to our constituents. We are also examining expensive items, that is, at the present time, projects or titles which cost more than \$300.00. These are subjected to review by a committee and, hopefully, if one library can acquire, in the interest of the other four, it will save duplication. Or, indeed, if two have to acquire in the interest of the other two this saves on duplication.

Now I would like to discuss the third, and last, major project at the present time, which might loosely be termed "mechanization." This is nothing more than the application of computer technology to the library operation. I am quite sure you, Joe Becker, and others around you are well versed in this. The opportunities seem to be considerable. The theoretical model is that the operation of your library consist, in large part, of the maintenance of files, large files or little files, according to a list of rather formal protocols, whether the files be card catalogs, an acquisition file, or a serial check-in file. This operation is very labor intensive, and, as a result, costs have been going up. And because of the conditions I have just mentioned, these operations, theoretically at least, lend themselves admirably to the application of computer technology.

Well, as you are all well aware, we have been at this game now for fifteen years. Andy Aines has scar tissue--we all have scar tissue--trying to wring out what is possible against what is not possible or not feasible at the present state of the art. I think now, just be accident of history, that this is a very propitious time for networks to be moving toward application of computer technology. I say networks, advisedly, because it is obvious to me that no one library can afford to play this game by itself--no matter how wealthy it is--unless it can continue to count on the infusion of large amounts of money from outside sources, and I don't think this is realistic anymore. So we have made our commitment to create the one system to support the variety of needs for bibliographic processing operations for the members of the Research Libraries Group and, furthermore, we intend to adapt, as far as possible, software packages which have been developed at great expense at other institutions such as Stanford, Chicago, OCLC, and elsewhere. We now have an Assistant Vice President for Systems and a Senior Systems Analyst who are charged with developing programs. The libraries, themselves, as a condition precedent to mechanization, have all made a commitment to adopt the common standard of bibliographic control--the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules as

bibliographic control. How do you catalog and control the serial titles right now? There is a lot of ferment going on. How do we catalog books? This is in a state of flux. We are attempting this and our hope and expectation is that our awareness of our responsibilities to the national bibliographic efforts in all of these areas will assure the capability of the Research Libraries Group to respond to emerging national standards and policies for this particular bibliographic community.

Burkhardt: Do you foresee the possibility of other institutions joining this group in the future once you get moving?

Skipper: Yes.

Burkhardt: You are not foreclosing?

Skipper: No implication should be drawn from the fact that I didn't mention it. I just forgot it. We will, indeed, anticipate inviting other institutions of similar character to the membership. We hope that we will be in a position to provide services to additional institutions on a cost-recovery basis. I can't be very specific right now because I am not in a position to offer services, but conceptually this is what we should be in a position to do.

Burkhardt: Have you run into any legal problems in incorporating and setting up? Anything that was unforeseen? I think you probably have less of a problem then, say, if you were a mix of public and private institutions. There could be legal problems.

Skipper: No unforeseen problems. We have had lots of problems.

Moore: You don't plan, then, to include any public institutions?

Skipper: Public as opposed to what?

Moore: State universities, for instance.

Skipper: Obviously, there are libraries of similar character within the state universities.

Moore: That is why I asked you.

Burkhardt: Do you, at present, have dues?

Skipper: Yes.

Aines: I have two questions. The first deals with the impact of extending your membership beyond one area, or do you find no difficulty in geographically disbursing the electronics and delivery of materials? Secondly, have you developed relations with other consortia?

Skipper: Let me try to respond. Distance could depend on the type of program. As electronic communications become more sophisticated, distance plays less of a role in controlling what you can do. So, conceptually, I would say that as we develop a system for applying electronics to bibliographic control, for certain purposes, we should be able to span the continent and tap data bases on the West Coast as well as on the East Coast. In sharing resources, there may be some practical limitations, simply governed by how fast United Parcel or anybody else can move a book from one place to the other. I expect that the resource sharing aspect would limit RLG to a geographic radius, except for very specialized materials which cannot be acquired anywhere else, and, of course, the weight. As for relations to other consortia, we have no formal relationship right now through RLG. Two of our members belong to NELINET, which provides them access to OCLC. We are applying for membership in a new group called the Council of Computerized Library Networks. We have tried very hard to keep these groups informed as to what we were up to. I have been to Wellesley and our systems staff has been to Wellesley so that Ron Miller would know exactly what we were doing and wouldn't lose sleep. I have been down to Atlanta talking to Chuck Stevens, and Stevens' new man for systems has been to see us. We are trying very hard to keep in touch. We have been to Columbus, Ohio, and have had long chats with Fred Kilgour. In other words, we are trying to make our position perfectly apparent and not keep people in the dark as to what we are doing and what we intend to do.

Burkhardt: This involves compatibility, too.

Aines: The answer I am trying to understand is--being a member of NELINET with any commitments they make within that organization--does it create any difficulty in terms of your effort? Do they find themselves moving in two directions simultaneously? Making choices they find are almost impossible to make.

Skipper: Probably. Do I have five minutes to talk about mechanization in depth?

Burkhardt: Yes, sure.

Skipper: We have had a very good committee. Some of the best people in the country, as far as I can see, who were given a charge. I told them to describe, in detail, the type of bibliographic processing system that RLG needed. Define the products and services which should come from this system. This they have done. It has been blessed by all of the institutions, and now we are setting about implementing.

I have already mentioned the fact that we are all committed to a single cataloging standard. We are talking about creating a single catalog for RLG. Now that single catalog can be displayed locally by a variety of means, whether you are talking about cards in a catalog or whether you are looking at a book, or a microfiche, or, someday, CRT on-line access. But we are creating a common data base, a common catalog for all four institutions. And, indeed, for members who join in the future. I am not using the OCLC analogy by way of criticism. I am using it because you understand it, and it will help you to understand the difference between OCLC and RLG. OCLC essentially is a card-catalog service. It provides cards to go into local catalogs and the success has been overwhelming. It has been marvelous and it is remarkable when you realize what has been attained. For RLG, however, we see a variety of difficulties as far as our purposes are concerned, and this certainly does not imply criticism of what other people do or want to do. I said we want a single catalog. You cannot get a single catalog without authority control. OCLC does not have authority control. It was a good decision at the time and it served their needs well. It does not serve our needs. If you look at budgets, people who are spending large sums on data bases, you will find that up to half of their budget goes into just maintaining, updating, and massaging those data bases--and they are getting bigger every year. That is a lot of money. You will also find that 30 to 45% of the information in those data bases are never used.

Now, what we are proposing with the Library of Congress is to examine the technical feasibility and the economics of an alternative mode of accessing and utilizing source records created at the national level and beyond that, putting us in a position to contribute to that pool by sharing a common authority file with the Library of Congress. The concept, very simply, is for a pilot project just to determine the economics and technical feasibility on a very elementary electronic communications level. We want to test the hypothesis that the RLG file would consist only of records identified with RLG libraries. Only holdings by RLG libraries would be in this file. AS RLG catalogs the material that would be the first file the inquiry goes to. If they make a hit, they have their cataloging information. If they don't hit it there, then they are flipped automatically to the national data base at the Library of Congress, and that record is then pulled into the RLG base and used. This, of course, you see, relieves a continuing loan on the Library of Congress, which for technical reasons can support only a certain amount of activity, and what we are attempting to do is not just solve RLG's problem but to create a model which can be used by any network in this country accessing information at the Library of Congress, rather than getting tapes shipped to them weekly or biweekly and updating local files. This is basically what we are attempting to do in Phase I of this program.

Phase II, if Phase I is successful, will be an effort to provide more sophisticated communications linkage between files with agreed upon protocols so that, for an example, if we do not make a hit within the RLG base, the inquiry is automatically routed to LC, if it is not there, it is automatically routed to Stanford, Chicago, OCLC, which is not now possible--we have no technique for doing this at the present time. At present, it is similar to making a long distance telephone call to Fred, and he is not in Bennington, so you hang up and you pick up the instrument again and try ACLS, he's not there, so you hang up and try NCLIS. The system we are working on will, by prearranged code, track that guy around until you find him.

Scott: When you finally go to OCLC, that doesn't mean that the cataloger accepts that.

Skipper: No. It does not. In fact, right now, Yale, I believe this is true, is using only records put in there which can be identified with the Library of Congress.

Burkhardt: Is there a distinction to be made between the authority file and the retrieval problem, the finding problem involving, possibly, another set of descriptors. Have you worked out what the simplest way of finding a book is? What do you need to get to it?

Skipper: We think we know, and most of this came from Fred Kilgour's development and the Library of Congress. This is a post-coordinated and pre-coordinated search key where you go to 3 3 1 or the 2 2 3 or whatnot. We have not really examined this in detail enough to determine what strategy we would use. This is down the road yet.

Cuadra: What is needed at the LC end of the line in Phase I when you have automatic switching? Are you talking about something that exists, that might, or will, and when?

Skipper: What we are doing is using existing off-the-shelf technology to provide access.

Cuadra: Is that something that is already functioning where people can dial into LC ?

Lorenz: I think it is in-house communication only. I am not sure we have any external access.

Skipper: You don't. This is different. We want to come in direct by wire.

Lorenz: But the fact we can do it in-house means that we can go external fairly easily, I believe, but I am not sure.

Skipper: I came into this job after having managed the European Division, and I have been amazed at the reaction that came about when RLG was formed. Frankly, it has been baffling. It is baffling to me because, as you know and appreciate, the relationship with publishers has been mother's milk to librarianship. It has been hand-in-glove. I have been puzzling myself trying to determine just what the situation is, and I am still not sure I know. I imagine the publishers are hurting economically. They are hurting because of the loss of purchasing power, which you are well familiar. Librarians can't print money; librarians go to jail if they try deficit financing. We have to cut back our acquisitions. There is no way around it. Now if you are looking for scapegoats, you can say, "Well, these rascals in RLG got together with a conspiracy so they could cut back their purchases of materials." This simply is not true. We had to do this whether RLG existed or not. Now having made your cuts, or in making your cuts, which is even more important, how do you do it? Does each guy just stand off in his corner and cut unilaterally, or do they try to trim to complement each other's collections? I am setting up a straw man because it is obviously better to coordinate the way you both cut back as well as develop your collections in the future. Now, having done that, how do you provide more effective access to the collected pool? We have been shifting books around by inter-library loan for quite a while. Then came a new technology--the copying industry. And, to date, the benefits of that industry had been shared with library patrons as well as with business itself. The library patron finds it much easier to come in and copy a section rather than use a ballpoint pen. Now, things get sticky, and I cannot agree with the position--and this is my personal opinion, not RLG's--of some folks in the education community who insist on unlimited copying. I simply cannot agree with that. But, I do think that it is in the interest of society--and mind you libraries do not copy for themselves, they respond to copying needs by their constituents--in my opinion, the fair use concept is a very sound concept. This says, in effect, that the library can provide facilities for on-demand, single copy access to text with no profit to the library. I think this concept is in the general interest of society.

I think there is a misunderstanding as to what would happen if you had a licensing situation, with fees being paid over to publishers and/or authors. It has never been very clear to me as to what they are talking about. The bulk of materials copied in libraries that I have had anything to do with were written by scholars who were interested in and whose business was the dissemination of information. They were not being paid like a novelist for royalties, and, secondly, the thing that gets a little sticky here and there, is the fact that for many of these journals, libraries are being charged

a subscription differential. They are paying more for their subscription than individuals. For many of these articles, the publisher is receiving a subsidy by way of page charges, most of which comes from the Federal Government. So, it is a very complex situation, as you well know.

Burkhardt: We have had some flak from publishers. What's their case?

Skipper: Their case is based on the charge of economic damage and conspiracy.

Burkhardt: But if you are cutting down their sales by photocopying single issues, this might be considered by publishers as illegal and a violation of copyright. You don't violate copyright by not buying.

Lerner: As a publisher, I will add that they think in terms of a conspiracy--that one would buy and the other wouldn't. Therefore, that is a conspiracy.

Valde: Concentration on reducing subscriptions.

Skipper: I said that we would all probably have to maintain the same level of collecting for the "basic areas" of teaching and research. By peripheral, I mean materials in the field of Dutch, Modern Greek, public documents in Bangladesh, African newspapers, Icelandic literature, the retaining of major files of city directories and telephones, patents, these kind of things.

Price: Sticking with the U.S. copyright materials, what do you find peripheral there?

Skipper: I find very little peripheral there.

Scott: If Harvard subscribes to a serial, would that mean that Yale would not?

Skipper: It all depends. I am not trying to dodge the issue, but I cannot judge how important a title is likely to be in meeting the teaching and research needs of other institutions. The answer is that if it is, and they all have rather ambitious programs, I believe, they would probably get it, no question.

Scott: So there is some faculty input here?

Skipper: You had better believe it. Not formal review. We have to continue supporting our faculty, no question about it. Our problem right now is to bring our faculty along with us in saying, "you know it's stupid for each of us to attempt to collect Albanian literature in depth." This is the kind of thing that we are trying to avoid. Have one person assigned Albanian literature and the other three have their options. They may collect at a teaching level, which is

considerably different by a factor of 8 to 10 from the research level.

Burkhardt: A lot of cuts in the periodicals do turn out to be rather exotic foreign materials.

Skipper: I go down to the bibliographic center and examine those publications coming through and, to date, they are quite rare and exotic.

Casey: Is this copying quite extensive? Please define "extensive." Secondly, when you do copy something--let's assume that someone at Yale wants something Harvard has and Harvard has to copy that page--is there a cost to Yale? Is this free?

Skipper: The library is compensated. Right now we are working on a pilot program with members of RLG and we are using RLG funds to support our shared-access program. Part of that support is to pay the local library for photocopying, if the original cannot be sent.

Casey: How extensive is photocopying? Is there any numerical indication?

Skipper: We do have statistics, but I don't have them in my head. The statistics consist of two parts. This is photocopying done by the patron on machines in the lobby. The second, of course, is photocopying done by library staff in response to patron's request.

Casey: Is it going up in volume?

Skipper: Yes.

Cuadra: You don't have a record of which publications being copied are copyrighted?

Skipper: No. This is very difficult to do. We just have a total. But, we are attempting to come to grips with this, again by the wonderful device called the computer. We want to be able to analyze all of the photocopy requests which are supplied by these libraries. Analyze it by type of publication, date, etc. We will not be able to do it by whether it is copyrighted or noncopyrighted, because this is too difficult in most instances for a clerk to determine. But we will be able to determine the characteristics of material photocopied--the data, the language, the country, etc.

Burkhardt: You could probably guess, pretty well, from the date as to whether it is copyrighted or not.

Skipper: From these records, we could, if necessary, do so on a sampling basis and determine whether it is copyrighted or not.

Cuadra: Is it your feeling that shared acquisitions of the sort you are doing is a rarity? You are not the first, certainly, but you are doing this--is it rare or fairly common among consortia now?

Burkhardt: Rare. Until now it has been scarcely done.

Trezza: It is one of the most talked about activities but rarely implemented.

Skipper: Let me amplify. The Center for Research Libraries is an exception. They have, for years, been serving the needs, up to now, of close to 100 members and at least in the past fifteen years they have had a very active acquisition program.

Cuadra: On the concept of single copy, you mentioned letting other members in after a while and, given the electronics, one could go all the way to the West Coast, and I suppose with the electronics across the ocean as well, you have a potential large usage. How would you define the single copy? If you copy a thing and you put it back on the shelf and one hour later you get another request, and then another request. What does "single copy" mean?

Skipper: To date, each transaction is a single copy. So, if you copied something a thousand times a day, you would still have a single copy.

Cuadra: The reasons for reducing acquisitions are obvious, and we have no choice. It occurs to me that we have a problem the Commission needs to think about. Some of the suppliers of information service also have economic problems, and it would make sense for them to sit in a room and decide, "Why don't you take the OCLC group and we'll sell to NELINET and to RLG, you sell to someone else, and that way we'll all be able to survive." They would go immediately to jail. They have an economic problem triggered by reduction of acquisition budgets, and, obviously, we need to think about that.

Skipper: Well, there are some publishers who refuse to sell to the Center for Research Libraries.

Aines: To throw you a wild curve--let us say that you go through this process; see some value attached to it and some commercial organization begins to look into the possibility of using tough-minded business practices and undertakes to provide that kind of service for universities and other groups. If they draw a profit on their operations, they want to stay in business and they have a requirement to be very effective and efficient.

Lorenz: What kinds of services are you talking about?

Aines: I am talking about the same services being provided to the four organizations, including bibliographic. A commercial organization would come to the Library of Congress, OCLC, or any other group. But I am just postulating now the possibility if this could be done commercially. This is not a recommendation, I am just probing into the future. What affect do you feel that kind of group would have on the whole institutional consortia build-up? Would this be a problem that might create a muddy situation for all? Is it something that is so wild that one shouldn't even talk about it in polite company? The point being that if it could be a profitable effort, chances are there would be some commercial organizations that would expect to participate in the future.

Skipper: I wouldn't agree with that. But assuming that it would be profitable--I say I don't agree because coming from the library sector into the commercial sector, I thought of many things I would like to do to turn an honest dollar and increase the value of my shares. This simply didn't make sense. It could be done much more economically in an institution or otherwise than by a private sector. But, let's assume there is something out there. I think we have responded in a variety of ways. H.W. Wilson, you know, controls periodical indexing in this country, except for your scientific data. Its a for-profit organization. Libraries subscribe religiously to H.W. Wilson. Gene Garfield, up in Philadelphia, started his own enterprise. You can have your own opinion as to the value of this approach, but libraries are supporting him right now. There have been entrepreneurs in the application of computer technology. We have not been so successful. I imagine because we were just getting started in the new technology, and we made mistakes just like everyone else. But some are still surviving. And some provide, as you know, bibliographic services. I can't give you any conclusive judgment, Andy. All I can say is that if someone comes forward with a viable product with the right economic implications, there is no reason why libraries should not buy it. With this exception. We have in the past been a nervous bunch of cats about micro-publishing. Micro-publishers, and I was in this commercially as well as a librarian, come to a library and say let me micro-copy your files, and I won't make you rich, but I'll give you something for the inconvenience. And he goes away and sells that product to other libraries. The difficulty is that he is sitting on that master negative. And this master negative has tremendous significance to the library community. We don't want to make money out of it, but we want to make sure that it is adequately preserved and that this job does not have to be done over again. We have given two types of responses to micro-publishers, depending upon how reputable and, indeed, how financially secure we thought they were, because if somebody goes broke in this deal, you can melt those things down to a silver content.

So, for the considerations I have mentioned, we have given a variety of answers to these people who have come to us. Some we have welcomed with opened arms; others we haven't touched with a barge pole.

Dunlap: You mentioned your pilot project in providing catalog copy to LC. Do you envision the time when your cataloging copy will simply be added to the MARC II tapes as though they were cataloged by LC? Will you have access to the authority files so we won't have the problem of having some other data base. Is this going to happen soon? Are we talking about one year or ten years?

Skipper: Five years. We have purposely maintained a very low profile. We have been profiting by mistakes made by people in the past who had a bright idea and got a group together and started speaking as though they had an operational system. This is being done. I will never forget being so embarrassed as one day when I was working in Washington when a group of German librarians visited. They were all starry-eyed and they came to me for advice as to what libraries with operational automated systems they should visit. I had to tell them the smartest thing they could do would be to get back on Lufthansa and go home. These were the days when I would be testifying in Congressional committees and the computer boys would come in and say, "You know we succeeded in automating Eastern Airlines seat reservations, what are you waiting for. We can do it." This was literally said in the Pucinski hearings.

Lorenz: In terms of electronic communication of copy over long distances--what is the reality on this? We have had the experiments with facsimile transmission. Is there anything more stirring in this area, or is it dead, or what can you look forward to?

Skipper: Again, this is for our technical staff. When I was in Berkeley, we got a little money, and we put in the facsimile link with Davis Campus. It was murderously expensive because of the state of the art.

If you had a bound book you had to make a separate copy of that page which could then be wrapped around the drum of the Xerox facsimile transmitter. And then the scanning was slow because we were operating on voice line--about six minutes to a page, or something like that. We found some interesting things, some of which are obvious. Your biggest time delay, and your biggest expense, is getting that text from the decentralized campus. We had 39 libraries at Berkeley, and a boy on a bicycle had to go out and grab that thing, wait for it to come back from the binder, or call it back from circulation, make the Xerox, put that on the drum. But the curious thing is that the biggest time delay was that the finished product would sit on the desk of the requesting institution for an average of six days waiting for the faculty members to come by.

Lorenz: Is it desirable to plan consortia in geographic areas?

Skipper: I think so. This facsimile transmission would be in the same league with optical scanning. And they are both very desirable, and they both may come some day, but I wouldn't use it as a foundation to build upon.

Burkhardt: Thank you very much, Jim.